



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,134	10/07/2005	Martin Hendrix	Le A 36 080	7514

35969 7590 09/26/2006

JEFFREY M. GREENMAN  
BAYER PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION  
400 MORGAN LANE  
WEST HAVEN, CT 06516

EXAMINER
----------

BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/519,134

Applicant(s)

HENDRIX ET AL.

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/22/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The preliminary amendment, which included cancellation of claim 5 and amendment to claims 6-13, filed on 12/22/2004, is made of record. Claims 1-4 and 6-13 are now pending.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 12/22/2004, are made of record.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Recitation of "and their salts, solvates and or solvates of the salts" in claims 1-4 renders claims 1-4 and their dependent claims 6-13 indefinite as it is not clear whether the claims are compound claims or a composition claims with salts, solvates or solvates of salts. Note Markush choices should be in alternate form and in singular.
2. Recitation of "compounds" in claim 4 is also unclear for reason stated above.
3. Recitation of "at least one of compounds as claimed in claim 1" renders claim 6 claims and its dependent claims indefinite as it is not clear what is intended. Note "at least one" can mean in addition to one compound of claim 1 as active ingredient, the

claim may have some other undefined active ingredient. Replacement of "at least one" with "one or more" is suggested.

4. Claims 11-13 are indefinite as it is not clear what meant by a process for the control of cancer. Is it different form treating or is it preventing cancer?

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making pharmaceutically acceptable salts does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvate. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The following apply.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

**1. The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:**

The invention is drawn to compound of formula I, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, solvate or solvate of salt thereof. Specification is not adequately enabled as to how

Art Unit: 1624

to make solvate of compounds of formula (I) Specification has no example of solvate of the instant compounds or solvate of salt thereof. Specification on page 5, fifth paragraph recites solvate or solvate thereof but there is no enabling of such compounds.

The compound of formula I embrace pyrrolotriazine compounds substituted with variable groups, A,  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$ ,  $R^3$  and  $R^4$ .

Even a cursory calculation of the number of compounds embraced in the instant formula (I) based on the generic definition of alkyl., aryl heteroaryl, heterocyclyl, substituted aryl, heteroaryl, arylalkyloxy, arylalkylthio etc would result in large number of compounds. This is of course not the accurate number and the true number of compounds would far exceed this number of compounds. Thus the genus embraced in the claim 1 is too large and there is no teaching of any solvate or solvate of salt of this large genus.

Search in the pertinent art, including water as solvent resulted in a pertinent reference, which is indicative of unpredictability of solvate formation in general. The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates or solvates of salts will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is

Art Unit: 1624

the compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the solvate. In the instant case of solvate a similar reasoning therefore apply.

In addition, an additional search resulted in Vippagunta et al., Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews 48: 3-26, 2001, which clearly states that formation of solvates is unpredictable. See entire document especially page 18, right column section 3.4. Note Vippagunta et al., states "Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates or solvates and hence generalizations cannot be made for series of related compounds".

**2. The predictability or lack thereof in the art:**

Hence, the solvate as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant are not art-recognized compounds and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

**3. The amount of direction or guidance present:**

Examples illustrated in the experimental section are limited to making the compounds not related to solvates and solvates of salts. There is no example of a solvate or solvate of salt of instant compound. Twenty seven compounds were shown in the examples of the specification each of which has come in contact with water and

Art Unit: 1624

other solvent but there is no showing that instant compounds formed solvates or solvates of salts. Hence it is clear that merely bring the compound with solvent or water does not result in solvate or solvate of salt and additional direction or guidance is needed to make them. Specification has no such direction or guidance.

**4. The presence or absence of working examples:**

There is no working example of any solvate or solvate of salt formed. The claims are drawn to solvate, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate or solvate of salt or even hydrate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ...' no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, there should be showing supporting that solvates and solvates of salts of these compounds exist and therefore can be made.

**5. The breadth of the claims & the quantity of experimentation needed:**

Specification has no support, as noted above, for compounds generically embraced in the claims 1-4 and 6-13 would lead to desired solvate and solvate of the compound of formula I. As noted above, the genus embraces over million compounds and hence the breadth of the claim is broad. The quantity of experimentation needed

would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired solvate of compound of formula I embraced in the instant claims in view of the pertinent reference teachings.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 7, 8 and 11-13 are rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification while being enabling for treating breast cancer, Parkinson's disease and schizophrenia, does not reasonably provide enablement for enablement for treatment or prophylaxis of any or all neurodegenerative diseases including Parkinson's disease and schizophrenia, any or all psychiatric disorders and any or all cancer. The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized above.



The instant method of use claims 7, 8 and 11-13, are drawn treating neurodegenerative diseases, psychiatric disorders, and cancer as well as controlling cancer by inhibiting PDE 10A.

Instant claims, as recited, are reach through claims. A reach through claim is a claim drawn to a mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality in general format and thereby reach through a scope of invention for which they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

In the instant case, based on the inhibition of kinase by the instant compounds, instant claims reaches through inhibiting and treating any or all neurodegenerative diseases, all psychiatric disorders and all cancers in general and thereby they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

More specifically, in the instant case, based on the mode of action of instant compounds as inhibitor of PDE 10A, based on limited assay, it is claimed that treating any or all neurodegenerative diseases, all psychiatric disorders and all cancers in general, which there is no enabling disclosure. The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer or any or all proliferative diseases due to PDE inhibition including those yet to be discovered as due said mode of action for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification at pages 27-31. The instant compounds are disclosed to have PDE 10A inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all diseases stated above for which applicants provide no competent

evidence. It appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as PDE 10A inhibitor that would be useful for all sorts of neurodegenerative diseases, psychiatric disorders and cancers. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host.

The scope of the claims involves all of the thousands of compounds of claim 1 as well as the thousand of diseases embraced by the terms neurodegenerative disease, cancer and psychiatric disorder.

Proliferative disease would include benign tumors, malignant tumors, polyps, lumps, lesions, other pre-cancerous conditions, psoriasis, leukemia, the hyper proliferation of the gastric epithelium caused by the *Helicobacter pylori* infection of ulcers.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm

to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally.

In addition, instant claims 7-8 recite prophylaxis. The term "prophylaxis" actually means to prevent spread of a disease (as per Meriam Webster's Dictionary) and there is no disclosure as to how one skilled in the art can reasonably establish the basis and the type of subject to which the instant compounds can be administered in order to have the "prevention" effect. There is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disease(s) or disorder(s) claimed herein.

That a single class of compounds can be used to treat all diseases embraced in the claims is an incredible finding for which applicants have not provided supporting evidence. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as ALS or multiple sclerosis are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many drugs, which can be used for "inflammatory condition".

The scope of the claims involves large number of compounds of claim 1 as well as numerous diseases embraced by the terms neurodegenerative diseases, cancer and psychiatric disorders.

No compound has ever been found to treat all neurodegenerative disorders/diseases generally and provide prophylaxis of the said diseases. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of neurodegeneration process and psychiatric disorders.

Art Unit: 1624

Thus, it is beyond the skill of neurologists today to get an agent to be effective against all neurodegenerative disorders/diseases generally. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See *Lucas et al. Pharmacological Reviews* 52 (3), 375-413, 2000.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating disorders/diseases that require PDE inhibitory activity.

- 2) The state of the prior art: A recent publication expressed that the PDE inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory.
- 3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all condition of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).
- 4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all condition and the state of the art is that the effects of PDE are unpredictable.
- 6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all neurodegenerative diseases including those yet to be related to PDE.
- 7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds

Art Unit: 1624

towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status

Art Unit: 1624

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

  
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

9/18/2006